

To be able to experiment with Moon Bounce communication!

de George, W1XE

Date: 20 Apr 93 01:51:33 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <wd6cmuC5Lpq3.DIz@netcom.com> wd6cmu@netcom.com (Eric Williams) writes:

>Tom Blackwell (Tom.Blackwell@f7009.n124.z1.fidonet.org) wrote (quoting ARRL):

>: "... It appears that the control operator

>: take corrective action where necessary. Therefore, in addition to

>: holding the originating station licensee and control station

>: operator accountable, we propose to add new Section 97.217 to the

>: rules to also hold the control operator of the first forwarding

>: station accountable for communications transmitted within a message

>: forwarding system."

>

>So what happens when everybody is running TCP/IP and the originating

>station *is* the first forwarding station in the system? Sounds like

>this is a quote from the old boy's club, where it is implied that the

>repeater owner inherently has a better sense of what is good operating

>practice than the repeater user. This model doesn't hold up in a modern

>digital network.

>

To which Ed Naratil (ean@VFL.Paramax.COM) replied:

This would seem to take into account the originator of the message claiming that someone else pirated his call (as in the infamous 900 message that started the whole thing).

Although the call of the first forwarding station or BBS could also be faked, it is harder to do than just changing "MYCALL" in your TNC.

As we all know, there are idiots in every organization (including internet users) and they will on occasion use someone elses, or make up calls.

And I say:

But this shows a fundamental problem with getting the message over that this is a bad rule: most folks think of packet radio as being connected

to a PBBS, but TCP/IP isn't like this at all.

You compose your mail (for example) on your PC. Then you pass it onto the mailer which will give it to sendmail to actually mail it off on the first hop of its journey.

The mailer then sends packets of your message to the station that will further route it to its destination as packets. These routed packets are just blocks of data that pass through the routing software, the sysop of that station doesn't normally look at packets going through the router (unless your trying to fix a bug in the router!) and so to its destination.

To further complicate matters the packets don't have to all pass through a given single router. Imagine the router goes down during the transmission then the routing software will choose the next best route and send packets to that machine. This might also be the case on mediocre or overloaded links (depends on the routing protocol used).

In this case who is the first forwarding station? The station who retransmits the first packet (the first packet sent or the first one retransmitted?) or the one who retransmits the offensive packet (one with 1-900-555-1212 or even F-U-C- K to defeat possible "obscenity filters"). What happens if the "offensive information" is split over two packets?

What happens if you tranmit a binary file over the air which contains the ASCII characters 'f', 'u', 'c' and 'k' in that order? what happens to the forwarder?

Of course none of this has apparently been thought about. Do everybody a favour tell the FCC (and ARRL) of your disapproval. Otherwise this rule is seriously going to restrict the use of innovative digital systems in amateur radio.

Make the person who sends the initial message responsible for its contents (but what if it gets changed en-route? digital signatures?).

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP

a-kevinp@microsoft.com

"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Date: 20 Apr 93 01:27:38 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu

Subject: CW = effective utilization?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX said:

Given the limited capacity of the bands, and how close to capacity the SSB portion is already, it only makes sense to encourage a mode that takes up 100 Hz instead of 2400...

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

OK then. Make them whistle 85Hz shift 45 baud RTTY (yea, that's a little wider than 100Hz but then it's close to 45 wpm morse. Perhaps we can make a non-standard 5 baud, 13 baud and 20 baud versions.

Yeah, that's the ticket ...

Paul you should stop these bogus "CW is the most efficient mode in 100Hz". We all know that if you slow down an FSK signal and use ARQ we would have a digital mode with machines on both ends being more reliable and having a higher throughput than human driven CW.

CW is a fun mode to use, but isn't the ne plus ultra of amateur radio, and isn't the sine qua non of amateur radio, either, though some believe this to be true.

How about we do the amateur exams in Latin. That would keep all those young CBer types off the bands ...

Yeah, that's the ticket ...

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP
a-kevinp@microsoft.com

"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Date: Mon, 19 Apr 93 23:16:21 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: 00 != Slow

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr19.174801.27371@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>Ah, now we've really gotten to the heart of the matter. It's called
>"keeping people out". That sounds like the underlying principle to me.

No, it's mandating the acquisition of a skill which leads to more efficient use of the spectrum. Sorry to disappoint you, but that's clearly **not** keeping people out for the sake of keeping people out, your ad hom aside.

>Another great generalization, and like its predecessors in this thread,
>also wrong.

The claimed benefits from OOPS lie on code maintenance and reuse, **not** in performance. Sorry, but unless you're willing to balkanize Shannon's law, you can't abstract without losing performance. But this is a digression.

>If movement to the CW portions of the band is the solution, what makes you
>think requiring it as a licensing requirement will motivate amateurs to
>move off of the SSB segments any more than CW's "spectral efficiency",
>lower utilization of its segments, and its ability to cut through the QRM
>will get them to move?

I don't have to show that it does motivate; I'm not advocating the change. What **you** need to demonstrate is that SSB use will **not** increase as a result of that change.

It's easy to show that this is not the case. There is plenty of empirical evidence to show that about half of all ham QSOs currently use CW, and about half use SSB on HF (the other digital modes are in the noise at about 10%). Moreover, the number of licensed amateurs in the US who are not allowed to use HF SSB is about double those so privileged.

Now, if if what you say is true, that forcing someone to learn CW is wasted effort, then if you drop that restriction, people will **not** learn it. To claim otherwise is a contradiction.

The net result is an immediate tripling of the HF SSB band load. That doesn't include the additional loading as CW dies out. Given that the HF bands are already at capacity on the weekends, the result is empirically demonstrated by behavior on the 2m band in any major metropolitan area, which, incidentally, accounts for the majority of FCC enforcement actions. Again, balkanizing Shannon's law is not an option.

The simple truth of the matter is that amateur HF spectrum is a limited resource, and that we currently ration it according to a licensee's willingness to learn a more spectrally efficient manual transmission method. Given the nature of the limited resource, it only makes sense to ration the resource based on a rationee's proven capability to use that resource most efficiently.

Unless you also propose some replacement system of rationing, you're being intellectually dishonest.

. What a crock. Let's bring back smoke signals,
>there's lots of under utilized air in the country. ;-)

Obviously, however, there's no shortage of hot air...

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1993 07:44:20 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: OO != Slow
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>No, it's mandating the acquisition of a skill which leads to more efficient
>use of the spectrum. Sorry to disappoint you, but that's clearly **not**
>keeping people out for the sake of keeping people out, your ad hom aside.

So is the associated principle then "require the most spectrally
efficient use of our spectrum"? This doesn't sound right, or perhaps
you are advocating eliminating all non-CW use of the bands? Also,
what does "spectrally efficient" have to do with anything. You're
telling me that if all amateurs decided to use AM that the FCC should
mandate CW? I thought these were **our** bands to do with as the
majority determines. This still is a democracy, right?

>The claimed benefits from OOPS lie on code maintenance and reuse, **not** in
>performance. Sorry, but unless you're willing to balkanize Shannon's law,
>you can't abstract without losing performance. But this is a digression.

A digression maybe... Balkanize, great word! Hmmm, abstraction causes
a loss in performance. Explain that, please? I don't seem to recall
Ada which provides abstraction causing a performance problem. In
fact, weren't embedded real-time systems the target for Ada? For that
matter I don't seem to recall assembly language which provides
abstraction causing a performance problem. To the contrary, it is
pretty easy to show that a lack of abstraction can cause performance
problems as the software engineer loses touch with the problem, i.e.
can't see the forest for the trees. I've not seen many programmers
take the time to optimize a subroutine the way most compilers can.
This argument has been had before and you are perpetuating a

programmer myth, but now applying it to OOPLs instead of 3 GLs.

>Now, if if what you say is true, that forcing someone to learn CW is wasted
>effort, then if you drop that restriction, people will *not* learn it.
>To claim otherwise is a contradiction.

I never said it was wasted effort to learn CW. I learned it, but certainly not because of some convoluted licensing requirement. I was working Aurora with CW long before I ever visited the local VEs. It is wasted for those who never intend to use it, or perhaps you are suggesting that we *force* everyone to use it?

You extoll CW's virtues and I can give numerous concrete examples of people learning it for non-licensing reasons. Yet you claim amateurs won't learn it unless forced to learn it. Say what?

>It's easy to show that this is not the case. There is plenty of empirical
>evidence to show that about half of all ham QSOs currently use CW, and about
>half use SSB on HF (the other digital modes are in the noise at about 10%).
>Moreover, the number of licensed amateurs in the US who are not allowed
>to use HF SSB is about double those so privileged.

I hope you are right! That tells me the majority are likely to have an interest in changing things. Nice thing about democracies, eh?

>The net result is an immediate tripling of the HF SSB band load. That
>doesn't include the additional loading as CW dies out. Given that the HF
>bands are already at capacity on the weekends, the result is empirically
>demonstrated by behaviour on the 2m band in any major metropolitan area,
>which, incidentally, accounts for the majority of FCC enforcement actions.
>Again, balkanizing Shannon's law is not an option.

Ah, balkanizing again are we? There must be a lot of enforcement action that goes on behind closed doors. Most of the NAL's reported by ARRL bulletins are associated with the HF bands and general class or above operators. But wait a minute, they had to learn morse code. Naw, they must have forged their CSCEs. ;-)

Why do you have so little regard for your fellow hams? Are amateurs unable to seek alternatives if the HF SSB segments are so overcrowded as you suggest? Must we treat them like little children and manage their playground for them? Where do you draw the line as to how far the FCC should go in forcing us to utilize CW? Should retesting be instituted? Perhaps requiring submission of logs demonstrating 20% CW contacts? Help me understand why we stopped where we did, if what you say is true.

Also, what *is* the behavior on the 2m band in any major metropolitan

area? Are you another "bash the no-coders, look what they've done to my band" ham? Around the Chicago area the behavior is, well how shall I put it, slow. At any given point in time, less than 30% of the spectrum in the band is being utilized. Scanning the FM portions yields a lot of idle repeaters, and the CW/SSB portions have at most 3-4 QSO's going on. Remember activity nights? They exist to try and *increase* the utilization of our bands lest we lose more spectrum to the next UPS.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Mon, 19 Apr 93 22:03:57 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!
csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr18.032936.15117@nnnptd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<C5o1r9.5x5@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Apr19.154848.19613@ve6mgs.ampr.org>sv
Subject : Re: CW = effective utilization?

In article <1993Apr19.154848.19613@ve6mgs.ampr.org> mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

>
>>As someone else so eloquently put it, "Quit whinning and just learn the
>>code".
>This is true, if you hit the 10wpm barrier, you will be pissed tho' You
>should have learned it as 'sounds' and ignored the chart ... (just give
>the sounds a name, you can fix it up later). Farnsworth is the best
>way of getting to 13wpm (fast, with oodles of intercharacter space).
>
>Ciao -- Mark

Yeah. All the people that say "Quit whining and just learn the code" and those who agree with it, I challenge you to just start standing on your head. Afterall, some people enjoy standing on their head and they develop a better sense of balance. Who knows, standing on your head may save your life. It doesn't matter that standing on your head is of little practical advantage anymore and that you can get gravity boots to hang upside down.

Awwwww.... stop yer complaining and just stand on your head. After an

hour or two you'll get the hang of it. It is relaxing and you'll be one with the brotherhood of other people who stand on their heads.

If you use your elbows you'll be pissed cause they'll get tired and you'll be sorry you just didn't learn to control your neck muscles better....

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Mon, 19 Apr 1993 23:33:35 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!csn!
stortek!georgen@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <-LVV5J0XZ@linac.fnal.gov>, <RFM.93Apr14232311@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<25144@ksr.com>.resto
Subject : Re: EME absolutely needs 1500 watts? (was Re: 1500 watts too much?)

In article <25144@ksr.com> jfw@ksr.com (John F. Woods) writes:
>rfr@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:
>>In article <-LVV5J0XZ@linac.fnal.gov> carlson@linac.fnal.gov (Kermit Carlson)
writes:
>> You of course are telling me that my running 1.5K for EME is wrong...
>
>A few months ago, there was an article in QEX (I think) about someone running
>a "QRP" EME station, with a mere 100W. Of course, he had an antenna array that
>more than made up for the "low" power.

I agree that 100w is "possible" but until you try it, then you'll find out why the "possible" is in quotes! You really neeeeeeeed as much power as you can muster with any kind of reasonable antenna! I think we should lobby for a 2.5 KW limit for us Moon Bouncers!

de George, W1XE

Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1993 03:55:33 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!

news.unomaha.edu!nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr16.023100.1889@btree.uucp>,
<1993Apr16.223346.5508@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com>, <1qutcd\$77f@ornews.intel.com>
Subject : Re: 10meters (Give it to CB)

In article <1qutcd\$77f@ornews.intel.com> zardoz@ornews.intel.com (Jim Garver) writes:

>In article <1993Apr16.223346.5508@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com> billn@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com (bill nelson) writes:

>>bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:

>>: stated this intent. That is great, but I think we all would like to see some
=====much gone=====

> I don't

>believe the effects of periodic skip conditions on 10-11 meters were

>properly understood or accounted for when the band was reallocated

>to CB class D.

When 11 meters was taken away from the Amateur service, loud cries were made to the FCC. The predictions were made that are very close to what we see now. Not quite this grim but very close.

The skip conditions were very well known then. In fact, there was almost no activity on 2 meters. Most of the nets etc were on 10. Very few could afford the cost of 2 meter gear. Home brewing up in those high freqs was just about more than the average ham could do. It would be like the average ham now trying to build something at say 10 gig.

I still think that the real reason for CB being on 11 meters is that there was a lot of equipment available. It all adds up to more dollars for a few.

Same goes for the no code. The mfgs and mags (inc arrl) saw a way to make more money. I don't mean to put down all the no code hams. Just saying that the real push had nothing to do with "helping" the ham radioobust the same old \$\$\$\$\$\$. Some things never change.

>In any case hams should be more supportive of CB needs and less
>critical of their operations. Otherwise 10 meters may become a
>defacto CB band if it hasn't in some places already.

>

>WA7LDV

>

I agree that hams shouldn't knock CB. I do feel that we should do everything in our power to keep ALL unlicensed operations out

of the ham bands.

"Ron", KU7Y

Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1993 04:03:43 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!

news.unomaha.edu!nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C5o1r9.5x5@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Apr19.154848.19613@ve6mgs.ampr.org>, <1993Apr19.220357.165205@locus.com>u

Subject : Re: CW = effective utilization?

In article <1993Apr19.220357.165205@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>In article <1993Apr19.154848.19613@ve6mgs.ampr.org> mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

>>

>>>As someone else so eloquently put it, "Quit whinning and just learn the >>>code".

>>This is true, if you hit the 10wpm barrier, you will be pissed tho' You >>should have learned it as 'sounds' and ignored the chart ... (just give >>the sounds a name, you can fix it up later). Farnsworth is the best >>way of getting to 13wpm (fast, with oodles of intercharacter space).

>>

>>Ciao -- Mark

>

>

>Yeah. All the people that say "Quit whining and just learn the code" >and those who agree with it, I challenge you to just start standing on >your head. Afterall, some people enjoy standing on their head and they >develop a better sense of balance. Who knows, standing on your head may >save your life. It doesn't matter that standing on your head is >of little practical advantage anymore and that you can get gravity >boots to hang upside down.

>

>Awwwwww.... stop yer complaining and just stand on your head. After an >hour or two you'll get the hang of it. It is relaxing and you'll >be one with the brotherhood of other people who stand on their >heads.

>

>If you use your elbows you'll be pissed cause they'll get tired and >you'll be sorry you just didn't learn to control your neck muscles >better....

>

>--

> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are
*
> * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily
*
> * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Wow, thanks.

If you hadn't made me do it, I would never have know how nice standing on my head makes me feel. Maybe I'll do it during the next contest.

Thanks again,

Monte "Ron" Stark, KU7Y

This Extra supports 5, 13 and 20 WPM tests. Even thinks there should be a CW only license needing 35 or so WPM.

Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1993 03:20:14 GMT
From: utcsri!newsflash.concordia.ca!mizar.cc.umanitoba.ca!mona.muug.mb.ca!
bwalzer@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr19.154848.19613@ve6mgs.ampr.org>,
<1993Apr19.174801.27371@nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993Apr19.231621.12745@leland.Stanford.EDU>p
Subject : Re: 00 != Slow

In <1993Apr19.231621.12745@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

.
.
.

>The simple truth of the matter is that amateur HF spectrum is a limited
>resource, and that we currently ration it according to a licensee's
>willingness to learn a more spectrally efficient manual transmission method.
>Given the nature of the limited resource, it only makes sense to ration the
>resource based on a rationee's proven capability to use that resource most
>efficiently.

>Unless you also propose some replacement system of rationing, you're being
>intellectually dishonest.

Neat! Ok, 20 WPM works out to something like 20 baud with 10 bit characters. With FSK it wouldn't be too hard to fit that into something like 80 Hz. You'd use a DSP to demodulate. Just let the no-coders operate below 30 MHz with the restriction that they could not occupy more than let's say 100 Hz (they might want to add some error correction overhead and still get that "CW" throughput). Or maybe allow spread spectrum with a resultant data rate not to exceed 20 baud.

The only disadvantage to something like my proposal is that one might start to see people complaining about all that spectrally inefficient code cluttering up the bands.

Bruce Walzer |Voice: (204)783-4983
1312 Valour Rd. |Internet: bwalzer@mona.muug.mb.ca
Winnipeg MB |BBS: (204)783-3617 (Ariel II, 1200,8,N)
R3E 2W8 |AmRadio: VE4XOR
Canada

Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1993 03:17:24 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!destroyer!
cs.ubc.ca!alberta!adec23!ve6mgs!mark@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>, <C5119v.5rv@fmsystem.ncoast.org>,
<930418.133623.7K4.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>G
Reply-To : mark@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

>You and your merry bunch of CB transplants will never take over.

They took over sometime around 1953 (about the time the appliance operators outnumbered the technicians is my guess), where were you?

>There are no-coders around here who couldn't tell me how to construct a dipole.

I took a straw (simple, unscientific poll with subjective connotations) poll after I saw this, adding in the number of operators I had to help identify what a quarter wave or dipole was, and it was clear that the numbers of technically incompetent amateurs was about equal in the code and no-code camps (sorry for the use of this word, it is inappropriate). However, the younger no-coders were more willing to learn, the OFs just wanted another antenna up...

I am so pleased to be able to reply to you, 30wpm 73 de VE6MGS/Mark -sk-

Date: 19 Apr 93 14:38:25 EDT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!eff!world!ksr!jfw@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <734085538.F00003@ocitor.fidonet>, <wd6cmuC5Lpq3.DIz@netcom.com>,
<930418.180836.5U6.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>world
Subject : Re: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032

system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

>I am somewhat disappointed with how the auto-forwarding issue is being
>handled. It seems to me that the first forwarding station being held
>repnsible for messages sent through his/her station is too cumbersome. I
>suppose it gives some persons comfort to think there is someone else to
>blame. Why not just make the person who edited the original message
>responsible for the content of his/her own email or bulletin?

The original author *is* responsible, it's just that they still want the
first forwarder to be responsible. Perhaps they are concerned about not
being able to identify the original author, and want to encourage servers
to have sufficient security to make that possible, or at least to ensure
that people don't operate forwarders that deliberately obscure attribution
to ensure that "no one" is responsible. Perhaps they just don't want
automatic forwarding, but don't dare actually say that, so they've come out
with something almost as bad as the current state and said "look how
reasonable we're being now"...

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #105
